R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 700 EA 000 527

THE EMERGENT ROLE OF ADMINISTRATORS AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER-ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIPS.

BY- DYKES, ARCHIE R.
ARKANSAS UNIV., FAYETTEVILLE, COLL. OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.92 23P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, *TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, *TEACHER PARTICIPATION, *LEADERSHIP, COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATION, BIBLIOGRAPHIES, COLUMBUS, FAYETTEVILLE

THE AUTHOR VIEWS THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR'S ROLE AS A RESPONSE TO SOCIAL AND CULTURAL CHANGES SHAPING CONTEMPORARY HUMAN LIFE. FOUR ASPECTS OF THIS EMERGENT ROLE ARE OUTLINED--(1) THE ADMINISTRATOR WILL BECOME STRONGER AND MORE INFLUENTIAL IN BOTH ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS OF HIS ROLE, (2) ADMINISTRATIVE VALUES AND BEHAVIOR WILL BECOME MORE DEMOCRATIC, (3) THE ADMINISTRATOR'S ROLE WILL BECOME MORE POLITICAL IN CHARACTER, ESPECIALLY WITH RESPECT TO POLICY FORMULATION AND THE SECURING OF SUFFICIENT PUBLIC SUPPORT, AND (4) THE FOSTERING OF INNOVATION WILL BE AN INCREASINGLY IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF THE ADMINISTRATOR. IMPLICATIONS OF THIS DEVELOPING ADMINISTRATOR ROLE INCLUDE (1) INCREASED TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL DECISION MAKING, (2) ADMINISTRATIVE ASSUMPTION OF A MORE IMPORTANT ROLE IN RELATIONSHIPS WITH TEACHER GROUPS, (3) INCREASED FOCUS OF TEACHER-ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIPS UPON COOPERATIVE GOAL ESTABLISHMENT, AND (4) REPLACEMENT OF ORTHODOX ADMINISTRATIVE IDEOLOGY IN TEACHER-ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIPS WITH A MORE DEMOCRATIC IDEOLOGY. THE COMPLETE DOCUMENT "COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION," OF WHICH THIS IS CHAPTER 2, IS AVAILABLE FROM THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, 65 SOUTH OVAL DRIVE, COLUMBUS, OHIO 43210, AND FROM DR. ROY B. ALLEN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS, FAYETTEVILLE, ARKANSAS 72701, FOR $2.50. (JK)

ED011700

COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS AND EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Edited by

Roy B. Allen
University of Arkansas

and

John Schmid
Colorado State College

Published by

College of Education
University of Arkansas

and the

University Council for Educational Administration

EA 000 527

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CHAPTER 2

THE EMERGENT ROLE OF ADMINISTRATORS AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER-ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIPS

ARCHIE R. DYKES
University of Tennessee

In attempting to treat the assigned topic in some reasonably adequate fashion, a three pronged approach appeared logical. First, it seemed necessary to say something about the context in which the emergent role of administrators should be perceived. Second, some description of the emergent role seemed essential. Finally, identification and subsequent discussion of the implications for teacher-administrator relationships were, of course, central to the purposes of the paper.

THE CONTEXT

References to the great changes going on about us are so prevalent as to be redundant. Yet, the dominant characteristic of our time is the rapid change which pervades all aspects of our living. No individual, no group, no institution, and no organization can avoid this reality or escape its consequences. This fact has profound implications for the emerging role of the school administrator. Administration in a world of rapid change must be viewed in new perspective. New demands and new needs which grow out of change force a continuous reassessment of our traditional understandings and perceptions about administration. its functions, its modes of operation, and the objectives it seeks to achieve. If we are to avoid the impossible situation of trying to apply our traditional concepts and understandings to circumstances which they no longer

EA 000 527

fit, we must undertake to shape, to consciously design, the emergent role of administrators. Using all the intelligence, the insights, and the understandings which can be brought to bear, we must seek the planned evolvement of educational administration in pace with larger social and cultural changes. Our failure to do so can only mean decreasing relevance of the administrator to educational problems and issues central to our times. One of the continuing tasks before us, therefore, is that of anticipating and implementing necessary changes in administration before the circumstances which require the changes are fully upon us.

The emergent role of the administrator is basically a response to the social and cultural changes which are shaping our institutions and organizations, our nation and the world. While much of the response to date has been random and unplanned, it is now essential that we consciously plan and shape the emerging role. Ascendant social and cultural forces point to emerging alterations in the role of the administrator and suggest what directional influences may be needed. The systematic and appropriate application of our knowledge and understandings in identifying these forces, extrapolating their implications for educational administration, and subsequently adjusting and adapting the emergent role of the administrator is essential. The propositions which follow, descriptive of the emergent role of the administrator, are based on the assumption that we shall plan and achieve an administrative role consonant with the emergent social and cultural characteristics of our time.[1]

THE EMERGENT ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Proposition No. 1. *The administrator will become stronger, more powerful, and more influential in both the administrative and leadership dimensions of his role.*

The major purpose of administration is to provide the coordination and the leadership necessary for the achievement of the goals for which the organization exists.[2] The efficacy and relevance of administration, therefore, may be measured by its ability to act quickly and decisively when

action is necessary to achieve desired goals. This is especially true in a time of rapid social and cultural change such as we are now experiencing.

Increasingly, the growth and complexity of Twentieth Century America requires ever more powerful and more directive administration. In the context of such a cultural milieu, students of government and administration have expressed concern regarding our governmental structure and administrative functioning. Woodrow Wilson, writing near the turn of the century, noted that "the English race . . . has long and successfully studied the art of curbing executive power to the constant neglect of the art of perfecting executive methods. It has exercised itself much more in controlling than in energizing government." He went on to say, "There is no danger in power, if only it be not irresponsible."[3]

Paul H. Appleby, in his influential monograph, *Policy and Administration,* pointed out that overemphasis on checks and balances in government has made the effective exercise of power "so dependent upon delicate interaction between its parts, as to induce very serious and chronic frustration among its officials."[4]

Many writers have commented on the "man in the middle" concept of today's school administrator. Exposed and extremely vulnerable, he faces toward several different audiences, each with its own, and frequently conflicting, set of expectations. Rendered impotent to act decisively by the conflicting expectations, his job becomes what Spindler called a balancing role.

> His job is in large part that of maintaining a working equilibrium of at best antagonistically cooperative forces. This is one of the reasons why school administrators are rarely outspoken protagonists of a consistent and vigorously profiled point of view."[5]

This lack of relevant administrative power creates circumstances not unlike those characterized by F. M. Cornford's commentary on the conditions at Cambridge University in the early years of the present century. "Nothing is ever done until everyone is convinced that it ought to be done, and has been convinced for so long that it is now time to do something else."[6]

Administrative power is essential if organizations are to achieve the purposes for which they exist. This is doubly true in a time of rapid change when the ability to act quickly and decisively is critical. Education today is conducted in a milieu of powerful and conflicting forces. Without sufficient administrative power, the administrator cannot maintain his relevance to such forces and his leadership is neutralized. Thus the schools drift aimlessly in the maelstrom of forces, needed action is not taken, and educational problems go untreated and unresolved.

The development of a science of administration represents a second emergent characteristic with profound implications for the power and influence of the administrator. As the complexity of modern society advances, decision making requires an ever increasing breadth of knowledge and understanding. Thus, the administrator, by virtue of his training and competence in administrative science, comes to play an increasingly strategic role in decision-making processes and will inevitably exercise greater influence in decisions. The growing specialization of modern society requires an increasingly high level of competence, knowledge, and understanding which only professionals possess.

While Burnham's[7] argument that managers will become policy-makers because no one else will possess sufficient knowledge and understanding of policy reflects an erroneous conception of the nature of decisions which policy-makers should decide, it nevertheless seems clear that the increasing complexity of the educational enterprise implies a much larger and more influential role for the administrator in shaping and implementing policy.

Proposition No. 2. *Administrative values and behavior will become increasingly democratic*

In the minds of many, administrative power is incompatible with democracy. This is a misconception derived from the conventional wisdom of our culture.[8] The central issue is not whether the administrator has power and authority but whether responsibility, both legal and moral, to the public will is effectively imposed upon the adminis-

trator. And this latter problem has little to do with the issue of administrative power.

It is generally recognized today that the democratic idea is one of the major forces impelling mankind. Whether manifested in the desire of former colonial peoples for independence or in the militancy of teachers in the United States, the impelling force is the same. In noting the great impact of the democratic idea on Western culture, Professor A. N. Whitehead once observed that governments generally have shifted from belief in the efficacy of coercion as a principle of management to belief that persuasion is a superior technique. Thus, a fundamental cultural assumption has changed from an authoritarian character to a democratic one.

In Western culture today and increasingly in all parts of the world, the source of all authority is recognized as resting with the people. The use of coercion as an instrument of government is no longer acceptable. It is generally agreed that punishment, coercive in nature, will not result in improved social behavior. Fear, induced by coercion, is viewed as the wrong kind of motivating force. The notions of self-understanding, self-guidance, and self-actualization are seen as essential to the development of the best individuals and the best society. Even recommendations regarding the rearing of children have shifted from severely prescribed regimens to more flexible regulation in a context of parental support and affection.

Such a pervasive cultural change has profound implications for the administrator's role. Expectations and attitudes of people within and without the educational enterprise are changing in a particular direction, and administrative behavior must change in the same direction and at the same or greater rate. Failure of administrators to recognize this great shift in a foundational cultural assumption, occurring so gradually that it must be observed in time, and to perceive its implications for their behavior can only mean they will be swept aside by the force of the movement. In a society increasingly actuated by democracy, the viability of administration is dependent upon the full incorporation of democratic precepts and practices in the administrative processes.

Proposition No. 3. *The administrator's role will become more political in character.*

Orthodox theories of administration have long held that politics and administration are separate realities, each existing in a self-contained world of its own, with its own separate values, objectives, rules, and methods. Assumed as a self-evident truth and a desirable goal, the politics-administration dichotomy dominated political science and public administration during the first four decades of this century. The dichotomy was given birth by Professor Frank J. Goodnow, an early scholar in the field of public administration, who argued that all governmental functions consist of two basic elements, politics and administration. Implicit in Goodnow's position was the assumption that administration should be exclusively concerned with the implementation of decisions reached in the realm of politics as contrasted with involvement in the decision-making processes.

While there has always been some skepticism as to the validity of this orthodox view of politics and administration, the evolution of political theory places the concept under increasing attack. Basic changes occurring in our culture are increasingly spotlighting administration as one of the major political processes. The amassing of sufficient power to achieve objectives, the exercise of discretionary authority, the making of value choices, and the deep involvement in shaping policy are characteristic and increasing functions of administrators; they are thus importantly engaged in politics.

Among the major responsibilities reposing on the educational administrator today are those of shaping public policy to accommodate the peculiar needs of education and the securing of sufficient public support to bring the policy into reality. The processes involved in achieving both objectives are wholly political in character. In a society increasingly characterized by powerful and competing forces, the marshalling of political power to achieve educational objectives is crucial. Without such power, significant action cannot be taken and education suffers from public indifference and apathy.

Today in our culture, it is exceedingly difficult to accomplish important objectives without widespread public support. Political leadership, in its finest sense, involves the continuous identification and articulation of what it is the public should support and the securing of overt manifestations of that support through confirming public action. It is this function which looms large in the emerging role of the administrator. Its importance is indicated in the following words:

> The future of public education will not be determined by public need alone. It will be determined by those who can translate public need into public policy—by schoolmen *in* politics. Since the quality of our society rests in large measure upon the quality of our public education, a widespread recognition that schoolmen must be not only aware of politics, but influential in politics, may be the key to our survival as a free and civilized nation.[9]

Proposition No. 4. *The fostering and advocating of innovation will be an increasingly important function of the administrator.*

A number of observers, reflecting on our times, maintain that there is no more appropriate concern for educators than the implementation of planned change in our educational institutions. There is general agreement that planned change is essential if the schools are to achieve their goals and maintain relevance to the larger society which they serve. Further, in the face of increasingly rapid cultural change, it is clear that the pace of change within our educational institutions must quicken. The case is well stated in the following quote:

> In the face of all these changes . . . the schools' society and culture seem largely undisturbed. Comparing classrooms now with classrooms of 40 years ago, one notes that at both times there were numbers of students not much interested in what was being done; the typical teacher still presents material and quizzes the kids to see if they understand it; the amount of creativity and excitement is probably no greater now than then. The development of new materials and techniques has enabled us to spin our wheels in one place, to conduct

> business as usual in the face of dramatic changes in the society and in the clientele of the school. The operation of the educational enterprise has encountered what can only be thought of by the traditional teacher as a very large number of increasingly serious obstacles and the new devices sustain the forlorn hope of protecting and maintaining, rather than changing, the old orthodoxy in the face of the most important revolutions in the history of mankind.[10]

A dominating characteristic of educational institutions, as in other social organizations, is their resistance to change. All organizations possess built-in devices which tend to maintain stability. Acting as a gyroscope, these devices seek to hold the organization in a steady state, or to return it to stability when buffeted from within or without. This tendency toward stability, seemingly inherent in all organizations, constitutes a powerful force against change. Thus, there is a disturbing paucity of change resulting from deliberately designed attempts to alter the schools and their programs in order to make them more efficacious in serving the purposes for which they exist.

It is this problem which looms large in the emergent role of the administrator. Traditionally, it has been more the role of administration to support the status quo than to promote change. Now the administrator must become an agent of change. The implications of such a polarized shift in role are profound. Traditional (and previously quite commendable) patterns of behavior, attitudes, values, and organizational structure may no longer be acceptable. In fact, our conventional ideology about such matters produces seriously dysfunctional consequences in regard to the fostering and advocating of innovation in the educational establishment. Quite obviously, then, this function of the emergent administrative role forces a rigorous and candid examination of our conventional perceptions and understandings about administration, its functions and objectives, as well as the general structure of the educational organization.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER-ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIPS

While the emergent role of administrators, as it has been characterized here, is by no means fully assured, it does appear to be in the process of evolving. But since the new role is still anticipatory, there is difficulty in extrapolating the implications for teacher-administrator relationships. There are, however, certain implications which if not clearly visible are becoming increasingly so. Perhaps, then, we can anticipate some of the major components of the reconstruction of ideology surrounding teacher-administrator relationships. A few of these, which seem particularly significant at this point in time, will now be treated.

1. Involvement of teachers in educational decision-making will become increasingly extensive and meaningful.

This statement comes as no surprise to anyone cognizant of the movements now occurring in education. However, it is contended here that greater involvement of teachers in decision making is as much a function of the emergent role of the administrator as the impelling movements now underway in education generally. Each of the characteristics identified with the emergent administrative role is directly related to, and in some measure dependent upon, the involvement of teachers in decision making.

Let's look first at the stronger, more powerful, and more influential role predicted for the administrator. It is axiomatic that the organization of collective effort mobilizes power. The more powerful role ascribed to the administrator cannot be achieved without the development and utilization of the power potential of the teaching personnel within the school system. If this power is to be manifested, the teachers must be organized and involved meaningfully in decision making so as to have a hand in formulating what it is they are asked to support. Without such involvement, their support is bound to be weak because the commitment which flows from personal understanding of the desirability of certain goals and objectives is absent. Thus, what may well be the greatest source of power for the educational establishment is utilized inefficiently, if at all.

When placed in this perspective, resistance of administrators and school boards to greater involvement of teachers in decision making is irrational. Their opposition appears to rest on the assumption that the school organization is a closed system with a finite power potential. Thus any power which the teachers may secure necessarily reduces the power of administration. But this assumption ignores the additional force which derives from acceptance of common purposes, the greater efficacy of integrated efforts, and the extensive interchange between teachers and the larger community and the possibility this offers for extending the influence of the school into the larger community. As Professors Ohm and Monahan noted:

> Administrative resistance to collective action by teachers may be dysfunctional for the system by preventing an increase in total power and the correlates of more effective coordination and integration of member activity. . . . The addition to and formal board recognition of an organized teacher group by the school system may increase the total power of that system in relation to the larger community and enable it to achieve its purposes more effectively.[11]

It appears quite clear that the stronger, more powerful, and more influential role of the administrator depends upon his ability to utilize effectively all power and influence sources to which he may have access. Important among these is the organized teacher group. But meaningful and intimate involvement of the teachers in decision making is a condition which must be met. Machiavellian manipulation will not do. Neither will superficial involvement in matters which are not fundamentally important. For power to be exercised by teachers, the goals of the educational establishment must be fully accepted both overtly and covertly. Only through participation in the establishment of the goals can the teachers acquire a sense of responsibility for them and be motivated to behave in ways which will seek their achievement.

The basic concepts implicit in the foregoing discussion apply with equal validity to the increasing democratization of administration, the growing political nature of the administrative role, and the function of fostering and advo-

cating innovation. But there are others worthy of consideration.

A fundamental ideal of democracy requires that every person have some systematic way through which he can participate, either directly or through representation, in decisions which affect him. The ideal rests on a basic assumption that decisions so made will be of higher quality and more effectively carried out. It argues that lack of involvement produces unconcern and lack of effective responsibility. Today in our society, the pervasive influence of the democratic idea has resulted in the general acceptance of this basic credo. Accordingly, societal expectations demand that it become a principle to be lived by as well as verbalized. In education, these expectations cannot be fulfilled in the absence of involvement of teachers in decision making.[12]

In a similar vein, the growing political role of the administrator requires an effective dialogue between the teachers and the administration in the shaping of goals and objectives, in determining what it is the public shall be asked to support. A sense of positive responsibility cannot be developed on any other basis, and the lack of such responsibility renders impotent the political power of the teacher group. In a society largely actuated by political power, education cannot afford the impotence of such an important source of political influence.

The function of fostering and advocating innovation similarly relates directly to the involvement of teachers in decision making. A number of writers have argued that present administrative practices and arrangements produce serious dysfunctional consequences in regard to the need for innovation in the educational enterprise.[13] These consequences flow from the undemocratic aspects of current administrative ideology. For example, a large body of research supports the contention that people will more readily accept innovations they understand and which they had a part in planning. Yet, these two conditions are aborted by operational premises of our prevailing ideology. The monistic doctrine of authority and the supporting system of superordination and subordination, the concept of hierarchical expertise, and the emphasis on duties and

obligations of teachers as contrasted to the rights and prerogatives of their superordinates all militate against innovative activities on the part of teachers.

Administrators sincerely concerned with the fostering and successful advocacy of innovation as a function of their emergent role must assist teachers as they move toward true professional status. In so doing, much of the bureaucratic ideology which pervades our conventional wisdom about administration must be recognized for what it is, a serious impediment to the innovative function of the administrator and to the democratization of the educational enterprise. Ideology which makes decision making a sole right of hierarchical authority is out of step with the impelling cultural movements of our time and belies the nature of the educational organization.

2. The administrator will assume an increasingly important role in the emerging relationships with teacher groups.

The common element running through the previously discussed emergent role of the administrator is the increasing power and influence ascribed to his role. The only alternative to increased administrative power and influence appears to be the steady erosion of the ability of the administrator to act in response to or in anticipation of forces about him. That educational enterprise must have leadership and administration offers the best means of providing it, although much of the prevailing administrative ideology militates against such a function. But ideology can be changed.

If this stronger and more influential role for the administrator is given, it will be felt keenly in the new relationships which teacher groups are seeking, especially in bargaining and negotiating. Specifically, it is suggested that administration increasingly will be central to the bargaining process. Wildman stated the rationale succinctly:

> . . . I am quite convinced that where collective bargaining is the order of the day in a school system, if the superintendent is to be an effective leader in his school system, he must have both working re-

> sponsibility for and authority over the collective relationship with the teacher group. The concept of the chief administrator as a "middle man," interpreting the teachers to the board and the board to the teachers, providing information, counsel, and mediating services to both during the bargaining process, does not seem to me realistic or tenable. It seems at least possible that one result of the establishment of bargaining procedures which provide for direct access to or involvement of the board from the outset of negotiations may be the compromising of the superintendent's leadership position and a weakening of the proper degree of autonomy and freedom which he may legitimately enjoy . . .[14]

The role argued for the administrator throughout this paper makes it mandatory that the responsibility for so important a function as bargaining be placed within the boundaries of administration. The processes of bargaining may not be conducted by the chief administrator, or even by an administrator, but the location of responsibility for the bargaining will be in administration.

This raises several new problems. Among these is the potential such a situation provides for the alienation of teachers from administration as a result of the assumed conflict between the two. How, in the face of this assumed conflict, is the administrator to provide leadership vis-a-vis the teaching personnel? The problem, while difficult, is not impossible of solution, especially in view of emergent trends.

A measure of the perceived conflict between administrators and teachers may derive from invalid perceptions of administrative power. For example, the conflict described by Lieberman[15] appears to derive from a distorted view of the status and legal authority of the administrator, a view not unlike that which John Gardner characterized as "a fantasy of capricious power." Such a perception of power is increasingly invalid. As orthodox ideology declines in prominence, greater emphasis is placed on persuasion (as opposed to coercion) as an actuating force. Power of this kind is not conferred by status or legal authority, but must be earned. It is manifested in the respect, prestige, and influence which the administrator enjoys. The difference in the two concepts of power as actuating forces is well stated by Blau:

> Compliance can be enforced with sufficient power, but approval cannot be forced regardless of how great the power. . . . Collective approval, in contrast, legitimates leadership. The abilities that enable a person to make major contributions to the achievement of a group's goals command respect. The respect of others for him prompts them to follow his suggestions, since they expect to benefit from doing so more than from following the suggestion of someone whose abilities are less respected.[16]

Moreover, one might question just how extensive and intensive the presumed conflict between the teacher groups and administration will be in the future. As teacher groups move toward greater maturity, there is evidence they become more concerned with professional matters and less welfare oriented.[17] At the same time, administration is becoming more democratized and the traditional administrative ideology is increasingly being questioned. As these movements continue, it seems reasonable to expect the development of more compatible ideologies and thus a reduction in the conflict between teachers and administrators.

Other tendencies manifested by the emergent teacher groups and in the emergent role of the administrator may be conflict reducing. As teacher organizations gain power, they tend to focus on increasingly higher levels of government. This is simply a practical matter deriving from the changing nature of educational government. Increasingly, there is not a great deal to bargain for or with at the local level. Coupled with this shift in location of educational decision making, and in large measure attributable to it, is the declining importance of local school boards. As this trend continues, the control which the lay board imposes on the administrator and which frequently results in the compromising of his professional views will be less effective. With greater freedom to act on the basis of professional convictions, the administrator will become more closely aligned with organized teachers.

In summary, it is argued that movements under way tend to eliminate the conflict presumed to be inherent between teachers and their superordinates. Over time, teach-

er and administrator ideologies will become more similar, more compatible, and conflict will be reduced. This will enable the administrator to relate more effectively to teacher groups in a leadership role, provided he can *earn* leadership status. And this condition is crucial to the stated proposition that the administrator will assume an increasingly important role in the emerging relationships with teacher groups, for one of the traditional ideological assumptions which must go is that headship is synonymous with leadership.

3. Teacher-administrator relationships will increasingly focus on cooperative goal establishment.

This postulate derives from the essentiality of the leadership function in the emergent role of the administrator and two related assumptions: (1) That goals constitute the integrating influences in an organization, and (2) that sought for goal achievement is an essential actuating force.

Under orthodox ideology, goal establishment as a function of superordinates has been accepted both as a self-evident truth and as a desirable goal. But there is increasing dissent to this position and a sustained assault has been mounted upon it.

Imposition of goals on subordinates by organizational superordinates has seriously dysfunctional consequences in terms of the two assumptions stated above. For goals to constitute integrating and actuating forces in an organization, they must be accepted and personalized by members of the organization. But when goals are formulated and imposed by superordinates, basic conflict is frequently manifested between the goals of the organization (as perceived by the superordinates) and the personal need-dispositions of the subordinates. This conflict derives from what Argyris called "a basic incongruency between the needs of a mature personality and the requirements of formal organizations,"[18] and militates against efficient organizational functioning, both in terms of goal achievement and the internal workings of the organization.

The successful resolution of this conflict between organizational goals and personal need-dispositions, or at least

the diminishing of it, becomes a crucial test of administrative leadership. As Argyris argued:

> Assuming that both must "fuse," if the organization's goals are to be achieved, and knowing that both will always strive for self-actualization, it follows that effective leadership behavior is "fusing" the individual and the organization in such a way that both simultaneously obtain *optimum* self-actualization.[19]

In view of our present knowledge of organizational behavior and group dynamics, it appears there is no way to achieve this "fusing" short of cooperative goal establishment in which appropriate attention is given organizational goals but in which the personal need-dispositions of the membership may also be expressed. In the absence of this process, there can be little or no sense of shared feeling or joint action in the pursuit of goals.

The ability of the administrator to utilize cooperative goal establishment as a means of developing cohesiveness and loyalty within the organization, the synchronizing of personal and organizational goals, the continuous examination and renewal of the organization, and the self-actualization of individuals within the organization will be central to his leadership function. As Blau noted, "the crucial problem for the formal leader . . . is to win the loyalty and legitimating approval of subordinates, particularly since his power may tempt him to dominate them instead of winning their respect and willing compliance."[20]

As the emergent role of the administrator becomes more visible, the essentiality of cooperative goal establishment will become more clear. Similarly, as the organized teacher groups become more mature and more professional, they will increasingly be able to share responsibly in the process.

4. Teacher-administrator relationships will be characterized by democratic ideology as opposed to orthodox administrative ideology.

The literature in school administration is filled with exhortations relating to the importance and desirability of "democratic" administration. But what has been called democratic administration has, in most cases, been closely

akin to benevolent authoritarianism. Implicit in much of the textbook material has been the assumed correctness of the system of hierarchical rights and prerogatives and of Weber's[21] bureaucratic paradigm with its emphasis on office hierarchy and levels of graded authority. Thus, the conventional wisdom of educational administration has come to rest on a rigid system of superordination and subordination, not unlike that of the military bureaucracy.

The unquestioned acceptance of the validity of this system has resulted in a monistic conception of organization, which is based upon charismatic assumptions concerning the hierarchical roles. For example, Thompson noted that under the monistic conception:

> It is assumed that the superior, at any point in the hierarchy, is *able* to tell his subordinates what to do, and to guide them in doing it. That is, it is assumed that he is more capable in all of his unit's activities than any of his subordinate specialists who perform them.[22]

This organizational stereotype and the supporting ideology form the basis for much of today's practice in educational administration. Thus, school boards and administrators perceive the growing militancy among teachers as a threat to their authority and design machinery to protect their status positions. Administrators become more benevolent. School boards talk about "allowing" teachers greater participation in decision making. But always the hierarchical prerogative remains, the involvement of teachers is at the discretion of the administration.

From our discussion thus far, it is clear that many developments are threatening the orthodox ideology. Coming as it does from predemocratic times, the ideology is increasingly at odds with democratic norms. Administrative practices prefaced on the ideology are no longer acceptable. Belief in unusual powers, or charisma, of persons in leadership roles has been discarded. The uncritical acceptance of the superiority of the superior is on the wane. Coercion is increasingly recognized as an undesirable way of influencing others. As a corollary, it now is clear that effective administration is impossible when based on formal authority alone.[23] Self-actualization of individuals within organizations is increasingly viewed as a desirable goal.

Thus, as the orthodox ideology fades away under the impact of emergent social and cultural movements, a new ideology is being formulated to take its place. This ideology will be manifestly more democratic in character and will legitimatize many of the rights teachers are now militantly seeking for themselves. Hierarchical prerogatives will be de-emphasized and rights and responsibilities inherent in all roles will be recognized. Authority roles will become functional parts of a highly interdependent enterprise and will be subject to the same examination and questioning as other roles in the organization. Teachers will be viewed as true professionals and will share accordingly in the governance of the educational enterprise.

A CONCLUDING NOTE

The central proposition of this paper is that education today requires stronger and more effective leadership than is currently being provided. While there are probably many ways through which the necessary leadership may be supplied, it is argued here that administration offers the most viable possibility. But achievement of this possibility depends on pervasive change in prevailing administrative ideology. Some of the changes which appear necessary have been suggested in this paper. If we will not or cannot reformulate our orthodox ideology, administration assuredly will become increasingly irrelevant to educational leadership. This reformulation of ideology should be the central concern of our profession, not because of the secondary importance to which administration will be relegated if the reformulation is not accomplished, but because of the leadership void from which education is suffering and will increasingly suffer as a result of an administrative ideology which is largely irrelevant to larger social and cultural circumstances.

The militancy among teachers is forcing a rigorous re-examination, an agonizing reappraisal may be more accurate, of educational administration in a changing world increasingly actuated by democratic values. This movement may thus help us perceive the dimensions of the required changes in ideology while there is yet time to do something about them. If this should be the case, the

militancy among teachers will be a powerful force for the improvement of our profession.

---

[1] A word of caution is appropriate here. We must avoid attempts to provide a fixed and final administration. Our profession must be viewed in the context of a world moving on a virtually perpendicular curve of scientific discovery, technological innovation, and social and cultural change. In such a milieu, there is increasing finiteness to the period in which the "best knowledge" or "best understandings" as we know them will hold true.

[2] This is not to imply that leadership and administration are synonymous. The assumption is made, however, that effective performance in both administration and leadership functions is essential to goal achievement.

[3] Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Administration," *Political Science Quarterly*, LVI (December, 1941), pp. 490-97. (Copyright 1887, The Academy of Political Science).

[4] Paul H. Appleby, *Policy and Administration* (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1949), p. 94.

[5] George Spindler (ed.), *Education and Culture: Anthropological Approaches* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1963), p. 142.

[6] F. M. Cornford, *Microcosmographia Academica Being a Guide for the Young Academic Politician* (Cambridge, Eng.: Dunster House, 1923), p. 32.

[7] James Burnham, *The Managerial Revolution: What is Happening in the World* (New York: John Day Co., Inc., 1941).

[8] A statement by John Gardner in the 1965 Annual Report of the Carnegie Corporation is relevant:

> People who have never exercised power have all kinds of curious ideas about it. The popular notion of top leadership is a fantasy of capricious power: the top man presses a button and something remarkable happens; he gives an order as the whim strikes him, and it is obeyed.
>
> Actually, the capricious use of power is relatively rare except in some large dictatorships and some small family firms. Most leaders are hedged around by constraints—tradition, constitutional limitations, the realities of the external situation, rights and privileges of followers, the requirements of teamwork, and most of all the inexorable demands of large-scale organization, which does not operate on capriciousness. In short, most power is wielded circumspectively.

[9] Stephen K. Bailey et al., *Schoolmen and Politics* (Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1962), p. 108.

[10] Herbert A. Thelen, "New Practices on the Firing Line," *Administrator's Notebook*, XII, No. 5 (January, 1964).

[11] Robert E. Ohm and William G. Monahan, "Power and Stress in Organizational Response to Collective Action," *Negotiations in the Schools*, ed. R. E. Ohm and O. D. Johns (Norman: College of Education, University of Oklahoma, 1965), pp. 75-76.

[12] More benevolent methods in working with teachers is not what is meant here. Involvement of teachers in decision making is a right which may not be abrogated. Participation is *not* at the discretion of the administrator. See Ronald G. Corwin, "Professional Persons in Public Organizations," *Educational Administration Quarterly* (University Council for Educational Administration, Ohio State University), I, No. 3 (Autumn, 1965), pp. 16-17.

[13] See Max G. Abbott, "Hierarchical Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations," *Change Perspectives in Educational Administration* (Auburn, Ala.: School of Education, Auburn University, 1965).

[14] Wesley A. Wildman, "Teacher Collective Action in the U. S.," 1965, in *Negotiations in the Schools, op. cit.*, pp. 25-26.

[15] Myron Lieberman, *Education as a Profession* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956), p. 485.

[16] Peter M. Blau, *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964), pp. 201-202.

[17] See Arthur Kratzman, "The Alberta Teachers' Association: A Prototype for the American Scene?," *Administrator's Notebook*, XII, No. 2 (October, 1963).

[18] Chris Argyris, *Personality and Organization* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), p. 66.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 211.

[20] Blau, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

[21] Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, ed. Talcott Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1947).

[22] Victor A. Thompson, *Modern Organization* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1963), p. 75.

[23] Thompson, *ibid.*, pp. 181-182, points out that "punishment-centered administration appeals to immature and regressive tendencies in people, to fear, dependency, refusal to assume responsibility. . . . It is based on essentially pessimistic assumptions about human motivation. The subordinate is pictured as a highly individualistic combination of laziness and greed."